



ITW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Takao SENGU et al

Group Art Unit: 2853

Serial No.: 10/525,371

Examiner: Manish S. SHAH

Filed: February 23, 2005

P.T.O. Confirmation No.: 5149

For: INK JET PRINT SYSTEM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: February 29, 2008

Sir:

Reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action dated November 29, 2007, in the above-identified application in view of the following detailed comments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the EP '195 patent publication to Smith et al. In making this rejection, it was asserted that the patent publication teaches the feature of the ink jet print system as set forth in independent claim 1 as well as the noted dependent claims. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the following comments is respectfully requested.

Before discussing the rejection in detail, a brief review of the presently claimed

invention may be quite instructive. The subject invention relates to an ink jet print system in which in a ink jet recording medium, previously having printing control information, is continuously driven with a conveying apparatus and print data is continuously processed with an ink jet recording apparatus set in the middle of a conveyance pathway to output a printed image. The printing control information involves information of various kinds about the kind of ink most suitable for the ink jet recording medium, the kind of substrate and the kind of an ink-receiving layer(s), and at least one item of information for controlling a conveying and driving apparatus, an ink jet recording apparatus, and a discharging apparatus for ink nozzles in the recording apparatus, a cutter apparatus, a tray apparatus and the like. The information is for controlling a series of the apparatuses of the ink jet print system on the basis of the above mentioned information of various kinds. It is submitted that the above cited '195 patent publication to Smith et al, does not teach or suggest such an ink jet system.

More specifically, from a careful review of the Smith et al publication, it would appear that the positions taken in the rejection are not accurate. In this regard, it appears the rejection has relied upon a very broad, and, in the view of applicants, an unwarranted interpretation of the disclosure of this cited publication.

More particularly, it is noted the specific portions of disclosure of the publication which were cited at each "bullet" paragraph as set forth after the statement of the rejection. Specifically, it would seem that these paragraphs are directed to the following claims: